

PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

June 21, 2000

CALL TO ORDER:

Chairman Dan Maks called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. in the Beaverton City Hall Council Chambers at 4755 SW Griffith Drive.

ROLL CALL:

Present were Chairman Dan Maks, Planning Commissioners Bob Barnard, Betty Bode, Sharon Dunham, Chuck Heckman and Eric Johansen. Commissioner Vlad Voytilla was excused.

Principal Planner Hal Bergsma, Senior Planner Alan Whitworth, AICP, Senior Planner Barbara Fryer, AICP, and Recording Secretary Sandra Pearson represented staff.

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Maks, who presented the format for the meeting.

VISITORS:

Chairman Maks asked if there were any visitors in the audience wishing to address the Commission on any non-agenda issue or item. There were none.

STAFF COMMUNICATIONS:

Chairman Maks if there were any communications from staff at this time. There were none.

OLD BUSINESS:

CONTINUANCES:

PUBLIC HEARING:

Chairman Maks opened the Public Hearing and read the format for Public Hearings. There were no disqualifications of the Planning Commission members. No one in the audience challenged the right of any Commissioner to hear any of the agenda items, to participate in the hearing or requested that the hearing be postponed to a later date. He asked if there were any ex parte contact, conflict of interest or disqualifications in any of the hearings on the agenda. There was no response.

1 **NEW BUSINESS:**

2
3 **A. CPA 2000-0002/RZ 2000-0005 – 430 SW 150TH AVENUE**
4 **COMPREHENSIVE PLAN MAP AMENDMENT AND REZONE**

5 This proposal is to amend the Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Maps to add this
6 parcel and to designate it Urban Standard Residential and R-7. The site is located
7 east of SW 150th Avenue and north of Walker Road. The site is within the
8 Washington County Residential zone (5 units to the acre) and is approximately
9 1.5 acres in size. Tax Lot 05905; Map 1S105AD.

10
11 On question, Senior Planner Alan Whitworth informed Chairman Maks that no
12 film of the site is available.

13
14 On question, no members of the Planning Commission reported that they had
15 visited the site, with the exception of Chairman Maks, who indicated he had not
16 made a direct site visit, but merely driven by the site.

17
18 Mr. Whitworth presented the Staff Report and described this proposed
19 amendment to the Comprehensive Plan Map and Rezone. He described this
20 amendment, which would assign City designations for the Comprehensive Plan
21 and zoning to a property which is in the process of being annexed into the City of
22 Beaverton. This property is currently Washington County Residential (5 units to
23 the acre) and will be City of Beaverton Urban Standard Residential (R-7), with a
24 minimum lot size of 7,000 square feet. This is consistent with the Washington
25 County/Beaverton Urban Planning Area Agreement. He mentioned a letter
26 submitted in opposition to R-2 zoning, which is not the issue at this time, although
27 the purchaser of the property has expressed an interest in rezoning this property to
28 R-2 at a later time for the development of townhouses. He emphasized that the
29 applicant can not submit this particular application for a rezone until this zoning
30 and Comprehensive Plan designations are effective, which will likely be
31 September or October 2000. He mentioned that the applicant had held a
32 community meeting on June 12, 2000 regarding their intentions.

33
34 Commissioner Heckman noted that while he had not made a site visit, the map
35 appears to indicate that this particular piece of property is land-locked.

36
37 Mr. Whitworth noted that a 20-foot easement exists on the south side of the parcel
38 on 150th Avenue, providing ingress and egress to the property.

39
40 Commissioner Heckman questioned whether a 20-foot easement is sufficient to
41 meet criteria for the Fire Department.

42
43 Mr. Whitworth advised Commissioner Heckman that the applicant has also
44 acquired the parcel to the south.

45

1 Commissioner Heckman observed that his primary concern had been whether this
2 property is landlocked, which it is, although it appears that any problems are
3 being resolved.

4
5 **PUBLIC TESTIMONY:**

6
7 **CHARLES and NANCY NYEHART**, 14890 SW Surrey Street, Beaverton, OR
8 97006 , appeared in opposition to the Comprehensive Plan Amendment and
9 Rezone. Ms. Nyehart mentioned that their concern involves a letter they received
10 regarding the development of the property.

11
12 Chairman Maks advised Ms. Nyehart that the proposed development of the
13 property is not the issue at this time and can not be discussed.

14
15 Observing that they had not been aware of this, Ms. Nyehart questioned whether
16 she is correct in assuming that they will have to wait to provide testimony until
17 September or October 2000, at which time the application for the development of
18 this property will be submitted.

19
20 Chairman Maks informed Ms. Nyhart that she is correct in assuming that no
21 testimony regarding the development of this property will be accepted until that
22 application has been received.

23
24 Mr. Nyehart pointed out that they do not object with the current application.

25
26 Chairman Maks clarified that the issue tonight concerns the property becoming a
27 part of the City of Beaverton, rather than Washington County.

28
29 **JOCELYN BIRO**, 343 SW 147th Street, Beaverton, OR 97006, illustrated her
30 property on the map, adding that she has the same concerns as the Nyeharts and
31 will also return for the Public Hearing regarding the development of this property.

32
33 Chairman Maks indicated that no other yellow cards have been submitted
34 regarding this application.

35
36 On question, staff had no further comments regarding this application.

37
38 The public portion of the Public Hearing was closed.

39
40 Commissioner Bode **MOVED** that CPA 2000-0002 – 430 SW 150th Avenue
41 Comprehensive Plan Map Amendment be approved, based upon the testimony,
42 reports and exhibits presented during the public hearing on the matter and upon
43 the background facts, findings and conclusions found in the Staff Report dated
44 June 21, 2000.

45

1 Commissioner Dunham made a friendly amendment to correct the motion to
2 reflect that the date of the Staff Report is May 22, 2000.

3
4 Commissioner Bode accepted this friendly amendment to her motion for the
5 approval of CPA 2000-0002 – 430 SW 150th Avenue Comprehensive Plan Map
6 Amendment.

7
8 Commissioner Heckman **SECONDED** the motion for the approval of CPA 2000-
9 0002 – 430 SW 150th Avenue Comprehensive Plan Map Amendment, as
10 amended.

11
12 Motion **CARRIED** unanimously, as amended.

13
14 Commissioner Bode indicated that she would like a copy of the document that
15 provides the correct language for motions.

16
17 Commissioner Bode **MOVED** and Commissioner Heckman **SECONDED** a
18 motion that RZ 2000-0005 – 430 SW 150th Avenue Rezone be approved, based
19 upon the testimony, reports and exhibits presented during the public hearing on
20 the matter and upon the background facts, findings and conclusions found in the
21 Staff Report dated May 22, 2000.

22
23 Motion **CARRIED**, unanimously.

24
25 7: 30 p.m.-- Mr. Whitworth left.

26
27 **OLD BUSINESS:**

28
29 **CONTINUANCES:**

30
31 **A. TA 2000-0003 – UTILITY UNDERGROUNDING TEXT AMENDMENT**

32 (Continued from June 7, 2000)

33 The proposal would, if approved, amend the Development Code to allow the
34 payment of an “in-lieu” fee as an alternative to placing above ground utilities
35 underground. The proposed text would add a new section to Chapter 60 and
36 amend several sections of Chapter 40 of the Development Code. The proposed
37 amendment would apply to existing development only when redevelopment of
38 property is proposed.

39
40 Chairman Maks stated that staff has requested that this item be continued until
41 June 28, 2000.

42
43 Commissioner Bode **MOVED** and Commissioner Heckman **SECONDED** a
44 motion that TA 2000-0003 – Utility Undergrounding Text Amendment be
45 continued to a date certain of June 28, 2000.
46

1 Motion **CARRIED** unanimously.

2
3 **B. CPA 99-00025 – COMPREHENSIVE PLAN LAND USE ELEMENT**

4 (Continued from May 31, 2000)

5 Notice of the initial hearing on this proposal was originally provided on December
6 17, 1999. The Planning Commission conducted hearings on the proposal on
7 January 19, March 15, 2000, April 12, 2000 and May 31, 2000. The Planning
8 Commission hearings were continued on June 21, 2000. As originally described,
9 “The proposed amendment will replace the existing Land Use Element. The
10 proposal intends to complete Metro requirements related to land use requirements
11 in local jurisdiction comprehensive plans. Both map and text changes will be
12 included in the proposal.” Metro Code Section 3.07.130 requires local
13 governments identify Design Type Boundaries. The proposed amendment
14 modifies the Land Use Element to more specifically identify the Metro Design
15 Types, to specify boundaries and to collate common policies among the design
16 types. Existing language will be modified to the extent that information can be
17 made more clear, concise or consistent with other sections of the same element. In
18 addition, the proposed amendment may:

- 19 * Remove references to the City’s housing program and relocate them
20 to the Housing/Economy Element;
- 21 * Remove references to the City’s Urban Services Area and relocate
22 them to the Public Services Element;
- 23 * Amend the Comprehensive Plan map to coincide with Land Use
24 Element text changes; and
- 25 * Place text provisions related to specific sub-areas of the City, such
26 as the Downtown and the Murray/Scholls Town Center, in separate
27 documents as addenda to the Comprehensive Plan.

28
29 Senior Planner Barbara Fryer, AICP, presented the Staff Report and described this
30 proposal to completely replace the previous Land Use Element. She noted that
31 many policies in the residential section have been transferred to the beginning of
32 the element to apply throughout the majority of the City. She referred to page III-
33 5 of the May 24, 2000 Memorandum, pointing out a box in the lower right hand
34 corner that indicates that certain policies are moved or deleted, or their origin,
35 adding that these little boxes will be eliminated when this is adopted. She
36 referred to page III-6 of the May 24, Memorandum, noting that the entire
37 highlighted section will move to the Natural Resources and Open Space section
38 and become applicable throughout the City. She mentioned that these had been
39 pulled out from the Murray Scholls Town Center and the Beaverton Creek Station
40 Community and consolidated into more general application throughout the entire
41 City. She stated that specific policies still apply to certain design types, although
42 the more generalized policies will apply throughout the City, rather than just to a
43 specific geographic location. She referred to the section involving the mixed use
44 areas, which includes the main streets, the town centers, the regional center and
45 the station communities or areas, adding that although mixed uses are allowed, the
46 corridor is not technically a mixed use area, so it is included within the next

1 section. She referred to page III-9, specifically the box in the lower right hand
2 corner, pointing out that this particular box will remain because it contains an
3 explanation of the text beside it. She mentioned that it is anticipated that graphics
4 and drawings will be included as the document becomes more final. She referred
5 to page III-12, specifically Goal 3.5.2, which is highlighted, pointing out that this
6 entire text will be moved to a community plan.
7

8 Ms. Fryer mentioned that she has distributed draft copies of a community plan
9 concept, pointing out that the text actually includes this particular text which has
10 been removed from the Comprehensive Plan and incorporates the transportation
11 policies that are applicable to the area, although some could possibly be
12 eliminated. She mentioned that she included the Development Code sections that
13 are applicable to the Downtown Regional Center for informational purposes. She
14 mentioned several maps which are not in the packets, including the index map and
15 the Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map, adding that an overall draft map had
16 been including in the previous packet of May 24, 2000. She pointed out that the
17 Zoning Map is specific to the Regional Center, adding that it primarily includes
18 the Regional Center zoning. She mentioned the Functional Classification Map,
19 which is intended to be the same context, pulling just the Regional Center out.
20 She referred to the final map – the major pedestrian route map that has already
21 been adopted into the Development Code. She noted that the idea behind the
22 Community Plan Context is that each of the design types, such as the Beaverton
23 Creek Station Area, the Merlo Station Area, the South Tektronix Station Area and
24 the Murray/Scholls Town Center, would have their own distinct community plan
25 with all of this information available to the public.
26

27 Ms. Fryer referred to comments that had been submitted to CCI regarding a
28 memo, adding that they had met with CCI on two occasions, April 26, 2000 and
29 May 29, 2000. She observed that the letter in the packet and the response to Pat
30 Russell's comments have been attached for informational purposes. She
31 mentioned an error on page 6, specifically question number 9, adding that the next
32 to the last sentence should read, as follows: "Staff expectations fall short of the
33 regional target by 1386 dwelling units, or 9% (rather than 91%)." She offered to
34 elaborate on comments made by Mr. Russell and her responses to his comments.
35 Observing that several of the Commissioners had not come prepared with their
36 packets, she provided extra copies for their review. She observed that the City of
37 Beaverton is comprised of approximately 70% residential, less than 10% mixed
38 use, less than 10% commercial and slightly over 12% industrial.
39

40 7:21 p.m. – Commissioner Barnard arrived.
41

42 Ms. Fryer showed a graphic illustration regarding mixed uses and discussed
43 opportunity for the development of this mixed-use area, adding that this tends to
44 provide a picture of what the future might look like in the City of Beaverton.
45

1 Commissioner Barnard referred to a previous application hearing, noting that the
2 applicant had indicated that not enough commercial space is available within the
3 City of Beaverton for the zoning they required. He questioned whether a standard
4 has been established for residential zoning.

5
6 Ms. Fryer emphasized that staff is currently attempting to fulfill the regional
7 goals, noting that any new commercial will be mixed use or along corridors or
8 main streets. She pointed out that the City doesn't want additional commercial in
9 other locations, adding that the goal is to focus in the centers. She stated that we
10 will have additional mixed use type development and additional retail office type
11 development, adding that any additional industrial land is not anticipated.

12
13 Chairman Maks observed that annexation could provide additional industrial land.

14
15 Ms. Fryer indicated that Chairman Maks is correct in stating that annexation
16 could provide additional industrial land.

17
18 Principal Planner Bergsma stated that no specific regional standard exists
19 specifying the amount of commercial, industrial or residential land that should be
20 included within a particular jurisdiction.

21
22 Ms. Fryer noted that within the last few graphics, each zoning category is broken
23 up in terms of the actual zone, indicating the physical number of parcels
24 compared with the actual acreage in each of these zoning classifications.

25
26 Ms. Fryer referred to copies of four letters she had distributed from Pat Russell,
27 Leonard and Sharon Robertson, James and Marilyn Howe and Stol Rives.

28
29 Mr. Bergsma referred to an article in the most recent issue of *Your City* –
30 *June/July 2000*, which specifically addresses the proposed land use element,
31 adding that it had been distributed to all of the residents of the City. He
32 emphasized that the public has been adequately informed of this particular issue.

33
34 Chairman Maks observed that informing the public of this Public Hearing has not
35 made a tremendous impact in the attendance.

36
37 Commissioner Dunham mentioned that while she used to receive it, she no longer
38 receives copies of *Your City*.

39
40 On question, Ms. Fryer informed Chairman Maks that the Howes live adjacent to
41 the Hoops, adding that the draft land use map would allow either light industrial
42 or industrial park development in their area, as opposed to the existing campus
43 industrial development.

44
45 Observing that these are existing uses, Chairman Maks questioned whether the
46 Hoops would still be in conformance under the proposed zoning.

1 Ms. Fryer indicated that she does not have this information, and Chairman Maks
2 informed her that he would like to know.

3
4 Chairman Maks questioned the situation with the Gramor letter, and Ms. Fryer
5 informed him that their complaint refers to the nonconformity issue, although she
6 doesn't believe they would be out of conformity with the corridor designation.

7
8 Ms. Fryer indicated that staff is considering eliminating the Town Center Sub-
9 regional Zoning District as well. She informed Chairman Maks that in a
10 telephone conversation, she had offered them the alternatives of the Regional
11 Center Zoning or the Town Center Zoning or the Corridor designation, adding
12 that they still desire their mixed hybrid.

13
14 Chairman Maks commented that this explains their discontent.

15
16 Commissioner Johansen referred to page III-9, specifically Section 3.4.1; and
17 page III-12, specifically Section 3.5.2, suggesting that the language throughout
18 the text should be kept parallel and consistent.

19
20 Commissioner Johansen referred to the community plans, specifically what the
21 vision is for this concept.

22
23 Ms. Fryer described the community plans as primarily in the major design types,
24 such as town center, station community and regional center. She mentioned that
25 the future might offer some opportunity outside of periodic review, observing that
26 this needs to be completed by December 2000. She discussed the Oregon
27 Livability Conference she had attended with Principal Planner Hal Bergsma, and
28 mentioned a workshop she had participated in regarding the Portland Design
29 Regulations for different neighborhoods, suggesting that Beaverton might wish to
30 explore something of that nature. She mentioned that there had been some
31 discussion of established plan books, noting that any individual who selected one
32 of the plans out of this book would not be required to go through the planning
33 stage, but would be able to go right to building permits and construction.

34
35 Mr. Bergsma informed Commissioner Johansen that he is referring to
36 neighborhood planning, which is more intensive than anything the City of
37 Beaverton is capable of doing at this time. He referred to the tendency of the
38 public to adopt the "not in my back yard" attitude and how to overcome this
39 tendency. He mentioned that the City of Seattle basically allows each
40 neighborhood organization to retain their own consultants to prepare their own
41 individual neighborhood plans, adding that at some future point it may be possible
42 for Beaverton to develop neighborhood plans for each of the NACs.

43
44 Commissioner Johansen expressed his appreciation of what would be involved in
45 the development of these neighborhood plans.

46

1 Commissioner Heckman questioned whether the City of Seattle has its own mint.

2
3 Observing that the City of Seattle appears to have money, Mr. Bergsma
4 mentioned that each year they also set aside \$4 Million to give to neighborhood
5 organizations submitting proposals for projects such as community centers and art
6 projects. On question, he informed Commissioner Heckman that he is correct that
7 the City of Seattle is actually able to follow through and fund these projects.

8
9 Chairman Maks questioned how static the community plan is supposed to be.

10
11 Mr. Bergsma advised Chairman Maks that any plan is obviously subject to
12 change.

13
14 Chairman Maks expressed his opinion that some individuals in Washington
15 County appear to feel that this plan is actually etched in stone.

16
17 Mr. Bergsma explained that when the community plans in Washington County
18 were developed in the 1980's, a long and difficult process had been involved,
19 with the intention that the plans could not be easily changed.

20
21 Chairman Maks expressed his opinion that a lot of effort can be put into a
22 community plan. He mentioned that he had moved to South Beaverton over 23
23 years ago, observing that the population and demographics have changed
24 tremendously since that time. He pointed out that he is not so certain that the
25 community plan is necessarily a good idea and that some provisions need to be
26 made to allow for changes that occur over time and with circumstances.

27
28 Commissioner Johansen mentioned that he is surprised when individuals come in
29 and indicate that they have spent 20 years in a neighborhood and look at all the
30 people we've added. He pointed out that any plan assumes that we are going to
31 add people.

32
33 Chairman Maks noted that the needs and wants of a community create the
34 changes in growth and the type of demographics, adding that 24 years ago no one
35 knew that Beaverton was going to become a silicon forest.

36
37 Commissioner Bode advised Chairman Maks that she had foreseen this
38 development, and he complimented her for being much older and wiser.

39
40 Commissioner Johansen expressed his opinion that a consultant can always
41 demonstrate a need for whatever is being proposed, adding that some process
42 needs to be established to determine whether the proposed need is actually
43 replacing another relevant need.

44
45 Chairman Maks observed that Commissioner Johansen had brought this issue up
46 before.

1 Commissioner Johansen informed Chairman Maks that he had never received a
2 good answer.

3
4 Chairman Maks referred to earlier comments regarding certain percentages of
5 specific uses throughout the City – a sort of a “planner’s boiler plate”. He noted
6 that while the City of Beaverton has such a high percentage of residential zoning,
7 there is not adequate affordable residential, with the result that people can work
8 here but they can’t afford to live here.

9
10 Ms. Fryer observed that in the future staff might need to conduct an analysis of
11 residential loss, adding that the Comprehensive Plan Amendment criteria of
12 regarding the Metro Functional Plan does require an anticipated density and it is
13 necessary to achieve compliance. She referred to the matrix on page III-34,
14 specifically the attempt to avoid losing any of the higher-density residential land
15 to any other types of development.

16
17 Commissioner Johansen expressed his opinion that there is a huge difference
18 between what the public wants and what Metro suggests.

19
20 Commissioner Bode questioned what Ms. Fryer attributes to the seeming lack of
21 public interest in the actions of the Planning Commission.

22
23 Ms. Fryer expressed her opinion that perhaps the public misunderstands the
24 issues, adding that very few individuals had contacted her regarding this particular
25 amendment. She emphasized that she had been to CCI on two occasions and the
26 only comments she had received had been from Pat Russell. She added that this
27 particular amendment may be a difficult concept for some people to understand
28 and they are not clear what effect it may have upon them.

29
30 Commissioner Bode expressed her opinion that it is the obligation of the City of
31 Beaverton to better inform the public, asking whether Ms. Fryer is aware of any
32 more that can be done.

33
34 Ms. Fryer advised Commissioner Bode that she had submitted the article to the
35 *Your City* newsletter that does go out to residents, adding that she has been to CCI
36 twice and has attempted to comply with any legal responsibility. She suggested
37 that the Planning Commission may want to add other alternative means of
38 informing the public.

39
40 Commissioner Dunham referred to the two meetings with CCI, adding that each
41 NAC has a CCI representative. She questioned whether Ms. Fryer is aware of
42 whether they had provided the information to the NACs and whether they even
43 understand the information.

44
45 Ms. Fryer informed Commissioner Dunham that one of the letters had actually
46 been generated because the NAC representative had taken the information back to

1 the NAC, adding that she is referring to the letter regarding the industrial land.
2 She noted that she is not aware of whether the other NACs received their
3 information, although Pat Russell had informed her that he did take his
4 information back to his NAC.

5
6 Chairman Maks advised Commissioner Bode that unfortunately, while she will
7 receive complaints down the road regarding the stupid rule and the dumb set of
8 criteria, most individuals do not participate during the process and they don't care
9 until it is in their own back yard. He expressed the frustration that this has caused
10 him for the past 7-1/2 years, adding that this apathy is found at both the local and
11 state level and involves major bills affecting development. He referred to an
12 action that determined that schools could no longer be considered in the criteria
13 for a land use order, emphasizing that he had been the only individual at that
14 particular Public Hearing in the legislature. He pointed out that this is not
15 occurring only at this level, with this staff or with this jurisdiction.

16
17 Commissioner Johansen referred to a conversation he had with his father, who
18 had not understood a Measure 56 notice he had received. Observing that he is
19 aware that this involves some legal responsibilities, he questioned whether staff
20 had discussed internally the possibility of condensing the legal portion of these
21 notices and inserting plain English that the general public can understand.

22
23 Ms. Fryer assured Commissioner Johansen that efforts had been made to make
24 these notices more understandable in terms of format and language, adding that
25 certain legal requirements must be met. She mentioned that an additional
26 document, which she referred to as a "simpleton sheet", had been considered, and
27 the legal staff had determined that this would negate the fact that they had
28 provided an actual legal notice.

29
30 Chairman Maks stated that Measure 56 has very clear specifications, emphasizing
31 that it is not user friendly. He pointed out that every notice does specify that this
32 could have an impact on the value of your property, adding that this generally gets
33 the attention of a property owner.

34
35 Ms. Fryer mentioned that this does generate some response, observing that she
36 had received a telephone call today from a gentleman who had saved every one of
37 the pink papers he had ever received and wanted each of them explained to him.

38
39 Referring to Measure 56, Commissioner Heckman mentioned that the residential
40 community in which he resides has a governing board with seven directors, each
41 of whom receive copies of these notices. He pointed out that they had informed
42 him that they these notices are too difficult to understand and that they don't read
43 them.

44
45 Chairman Maks questioned whether the City of Beaverton's web-site is getting
46 many hits, and Ms. Fryer advised him that she has no information on this issue.

1 Chairman Maks observed that in political campaigns, an individual needs to
2 actually contact the public seven times to get a message across, although the bare
3 minimum is four contacts.

4
5 Commissioner Dunham requested clarification of the "simpleton page",
6 specifically whether the issue involved this document being a separate page or
7 due to the fact that it was redoing the original document.

8
9 Ms. Fryer advised Commissioner Dunham that both issues were involved, and
10 suggested the possibility of perhaps reformatting and improving our notices.

11
12 Chairman Maks questioned whether the problem involved the separate sheet or
13 the singleton language.

14
15 Ms. Fryer informed Chairman Maks that initially there had been a problem with
16 the separate sheet, adding that there had also been problems with including this
17 singleton language on the same sheet.

18
19 Chairman Maks suggesting placing a four by six-inch ad in The Oregonian for
20 \$1300.

21
22 Commissioner Dunham questioned the possibility of locating an abstract at the
23 top of the notice, consisting of a sort of a "Cliff's Notes" version of what is
24 included in the notice.

25
26 Ms. Fryer advised Commissioner Dunham that the very top of the notice has to
27 provide a certain statement, noting that a box has been added to the right of the
28 statement that includes one to two lines explaining the subject of the amendment
29 in more simple terms. Observing that it may be necessary to make some changes,
30 she noted that the intent is to provide a simple one-liner title.

31
32 Commissioner Dunham mentioned the futility of mailing out two pages of
33 information people don't even want to read, pointing out that most of this ends up
34 in the circular file.

35
36 Chairman Maks stated that market analysis has indicated that people receive so
37 much mail that 67% of it is discarded.

38
39 Ms. Fryer indicated that this is the rationale for the opening statement informing
40 property owners that the action may reduce their property values. She pointed out
41 that this information has to be included in the same area as the address, which is
42 made more difficult due to postal regulations, and as a result, the City sends the
43 notices in envelopes.

44

1 Commissioner Bode stated that she is satisfied that adequate effort is being made
2 and that although they are notified, people don't respond until after it becomes
3 law, at which point they complain.

4
5 Chairman Maks observed that people do read these notices and want to know
6 whether they need to be concerned.

7
8 Commissioner Heckman referred to page III-20, and questioned which LUBA
9 action the box refers to and which appellant is involved.

10
11 Ms. Fryer informed Commissioner Heckman that this reference is regarding the
12 adoption of the Beaverton Creek Station area, adding that this involves the Nike
13 appeal. She noted that the action involved that public access across Murray
14 Boulevard to the Tektronix campus specified on that particular parcel, and
15 provision for public access to the LRT station platform from and across Jenkins
16 Road to Nike World Headquarters. She observed that this had been negotiated so
17 Nike could retain more control over the Nike/Tek woods property in terms of the
18 location of the pedestrian access.

19
20 Commissioner Heckman referred to paragraph 3, V-10, specifically the urban
21 services boundary between the cities of Beaverton and Portland. He requested
22 clarification of whether these boundaries have finally been designated on a map.

23
24 Ms. Fryer informed Commissioner Heckman that this issue has been resolved, but
25 this map has not yet been updated.

26
27 Ms. Fryer informed Commissioner Heckman that one of the amendments in the
28 near future would include an updated map.

29
30 Commissioner Heckman observed that he has never personally seen a map that
31 truthfully illustrates this situation.

32
33 Ms. Fryer requested a continuance until August 2, 2000, requesting that any
34 specific comments be e-mailed or verbalized to be prepared in a more final draft
35 form for the next meeting, adding that adoption may require several more
36 meetings. She emphasized that she would like to obtain as much information as
37 possible, no matter how miniscule it appears to be.

38
39 **PUBLIC TESTIMONY:**

40
41 On question, no members of the public appeared to testify at this time.

42
43 Commissioner Bode **MOVED** and Commissioner Heckman **SECONDED** a
44 motion that CPA 99-00025 – Comprehensive Land Use Element be continued to a
45 date certain of August 2, 2000.

46

1 Motion **CARRIED** unanimously.

2

3 **MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS:**

4

5 The meeting adjourned at 8:09 p.m.

CALENDAR:

1				
2	July	5		<i>NO MEETING SCHEDULED</i>
3		12	<i>Public Hearing</i>	<i>CUP 99-00032 HOME DEPOT (cont. from April 19, 2000)</i>
4				<i>CUP 2000-0015 IHOP OFF OF REGATTA LANE</i>
5				<i>CUP 2000-0014 GRAMOR</i>
6				<i>CUP 2000-0008 FOUNTAINCOURT</i>
7		19	<i>Public Hearing</i>	<i>CUP 2000-0002</i>
8				<i>RZ 2000-0005 ANNEXATION RELATED AMENDMENT</i>
9				<i>CPA 99-00015</i>
10				<i>TA 99-00006 TITLE 3 WATER QUALITY, FLOOD MGMT.</i>
11				<i>CPA 99-00014</i>
12				<i>TA 99-00005 GOAL 5 RIPARIAN & WETLAND PROTECTION</i>
13		26	<i>Public Hearing</i>	<i>RZ 99-00020 CORNELL ROAD REZONE OF TAX LOT 100</i>
14				<i>TPP 99-00008 WATERHOUSE 5 SUBDIVISION MODIFICATIONS</i>
15				<i>CPA 2000-0003 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN TRANSPORTATION</i>
16				<i>ELEMENT MODIFICATION</i>
17	August	2	<i>Public Hearing</i>	<i>CPA 99-00025 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN LAND USE ELEMENT</i>
18		9	<i>Public Hearing</i>	<i>CPA 99-00017</i>
19				<i>CPA 99-00018 TREE INVENTORY UPDATE</i>
20				<i>CPA 99-00013</i>
21				<i>TA 99-00004 WILDLIFE HABITAT & TREE PRESERVATION</i>
22		23	<i>Public Hearing</i>	<i>TA 2000-0004 TITLE 4 IMPLEMENTATION</i>